



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## BOOK REVIEWS.

---

SOHM'S INSTITUTES OF ROMAN LAW. Translated by LEDLIE.  
Second edition, XXII, 639. Oxford, 1901.

Those who are familiar with the earlier form of this work will need no assurance of its value. Perhaps no single volume furnishes a better introduction to the elements of Roman law. The style, too, is "juicy" and attractive. The present edition is translated from the ninth edition in German. A peculiar feature is the number of additions in view of the German Civil Code.

In Part I, "The History of Roman Law," the Pretorian Edict is treated more fully than in the first English edition, and all of Chapter III is new matter treating of the Roman law subsequent to Justinian up to the adoption of the German Civil Code. The tremendous results of Savigny's work—both in the creation of the Historical School, and, as a consequence unforeseen by him, in the replacing of the corpus by the German Civil Code—are indicated in § 28.

In Part II, the Law of Persons is treated quite differently in the new edition. Sohm retains the peculiar order that puts Remedial Law before Property Law—as "Law of Property (General Part)." In this "Law of Procedure," he has made extensive alterations and additions in view of Professor Wlassak's "*Römische Prozess-gesetze*," particularly in §§ 49 and 50. In § 81, Sohm abandons his former theory in favor of Keller's view, and says: "The literal contract of Roman law was a fictitious loan which operated by virtue of the *literæ*—i. e., by virtue of the writing in the codex as such, irrespectively altogether of the facts actually underlying the relations between the parties—to impose on the debtor an abstract liability to pay a fixed sum of money."

In view of Rudolph von Jhering's "The Mouse-trap of Roman Law" in his "*Scherz und Ernst in der Jurisprudence*," peculiar interest attaches to Sohm's new account of the *usucapio pro herede* (acquisition by prescription of an inheritance). Sohm gives no less than three diverse views of this peculiar institute of the early law. If Jhering were still alive, a few "puffs at his '*rechtshistorische cigarre*'" might occasion an additional one! The book contains an admirable introduction on the nature of the subject, and the sources and fundamental conceptions.

E. S. S.

---

THE LAW AND POLICY OF ANNEXATION, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE PHILIPPINES. By CARMAN F. RANDOLPH.  
New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1901.

This is a valuable book. The author writes with great learning and conclusive force. However, it is out of our province to enter

upon a discussion of the policy or impolicy of annexation. The fact that in the case of the Philippines we have on our hands a lightly assumed burden, which ere long promises to become too heavy to be borne, is a subject within the domain of politics and not properly to be considered in a legal magazine. As an exposition, then, of the constitutional *law*, applicable to our new possessions, the first four chapters (being three-fourths of the text), are most brilliantly and forcibly argued. It seems impossible to escape in *logic* the author's conclusion that "the Constitution follows the Flag." He also argues strongly against any supposed necessity by force of political considerations to override the first conclusion at which he arrives. The great excellence of the book, however, lies in the fact that it expounds a coherent general theory of constitutional law applicable to the Philippines, and the author, by testing it in the important situations in which it might have to be applied, finds it is above all else practical. It seems clear, indeed, that the many arguments advanced against the possibility of having a satisfactory government in our island territories, under the Constitution, are all unsound. This brings us to the dilemma presented by our author: that the Philippines are a part of the United States or they are not; if they are we must govern them under the Constitution, if they are not we cannot govern them at all.

After considering the condition of affairs in the Philippines, the author turns to the status of Cuba in relation to our Constitution, and points out the anomalous nature of our occupation of that island. He is unable to find any authority in the Constitution for our remaining there, unless it be the war power. This he thinks, while not a wholly satisfactory one, will be a sufficient legal reason for our administration of the island.

The book contains an appendix of documents relative to the questions involved.

Without further enlarging on the book, suffice it to say that it contains a most learned and able argument on the constitutional questions arising out of annexation.

The paper and print of the book are excellent.

E. B. S., Jr.

GLANVILLE. BEAMES' translation, with an introduction by JOSEPH HENRY BEALE, JR., Professor of Law in Harvard University. John Byrne & Co. Washington, D. C., 1900.

This edition of the "Treatise on the Laws and Customs of the Kingdom of England in the Time of King Henry the Second," which treatise has usually been ascribed to, and is generally known as that of, Ranulph de Glanville, chief justice in the reign of Henry the Second, is, with the exception of the introduction, merely a reprint of the translation of "Glanville," by John Beames, Esq., of Lincoln's Inn, published in 1812.

But while the edition may be considered less worthy of note generally on this account, it may well receive the attention especially